UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,036	10/31/2003	Andrew John Bradfield	SOM920030008US1	1193

59559 7590 10/30/2008

RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER	
ABDUL-ALI, OMAR R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,036	BRADFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OMAR ABDUL-ALI	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 5-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 5-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the response filed June 20, 2008. Amended Claims 1 and 5-7 are pending and have been considered below.

1. The prior art rejections have been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sjostrom et al. (US 6,971,107) in view of Hobbs (US 6,523,022).

Claim 1: Sjostrom discloses a method of processing a web page in a browser, the web page comprising a plurality of frames, comprising:

a. displaying a first frame while loading a second frame (column 5, lines 14-30).

Sjostrom discloses permitting the user to interact with the first frame regardless of whether the second frame is sufficiently loaded (column 5, lines 14-30). Specifically, Sjostrom discloses a navigation frame is loaded with general navigation including links and buttons for the user to activate. Sjostrom does not explicitly disclose preventing a

user from interacting with the first frame until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded, said prevention occurring after a determination is made that the first frame depends on the second frame. Hobbs discloses a similar method that further discloses the use of modal windows (frame) which prevents the user from interacting with an underlying application window (frame) (column 31, lines 1-20). The user must wait to interact with the application window until the modal frame is loaded and closed through user interaction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prevent a user from interacting with a first displayed frame while loading a second frame after determining that the first frame depends on the second frame in Sjostam. One would have been motivated to prevent a user from interacting with a displayed first frame until after a second frame is sufficiently loaded in order to block application workflow to minimize the likelihood of an error.

Sjostrom further discloses the first frame is displayed until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded regardless of whether the user in permitted to interact with the first frame (column 5, lines 14-30). Specifically the navigation frame is displayed after the content frame is fully loaded.

Hobbs further discloses the preventing step further comprises instructing the user to wait to interact with the first frame until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded (column 31, lines 1-20). A modal window is displayed which instructs the user to wait to interact with the first window by freezing the content of the first window until the second window is dismissed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to instruct the user to wait to interact with the first frame until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded in

Sjostrom. One would have been motivated to include this feature in order to block application workflow to minimize the likelihood of an error.

Claim 5: Sjostrom and Hobbs disclose a system for making a web browser act like a stand-alone application as in Claim 1 above, and Sjostrom further discloses the second portion is sufficiently loaded when it is fully loaded (column 31, lines 1-20).

Claim 6: Sjostrom and Hobbs disclose a system for making a web browser act like a stand-alone application as in Claim 1 above, and Sjostrom further discloses the browser is implemented on a client computer system (Figure 1).

Claim 7: Sjostrom and Hobbs disclose a system for making a web browser act like a stand-alone application as in Claim 1 above, and Sjostrom further discloses the browser is implemented on a client computer system the browser comprises a web browser (Figure 1).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 5-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178